

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Independent claims 1, 11, 14 and 15 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

In addition, new claims 16-18 have been added to depend from claim 1.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 3-5, and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Knee et al. (U.S. 6,769,128), Hendricks et al. (U.S. 7,134,131) and Strubbe (U.S. 2003/0128187). Further, claims 11, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Hendricks and Strubbe. Finally, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Knee, Hendricks and Krzyzanowski et al. (U.S. 2006/0053447). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 11, 14 and 15 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites an apparatus that includes a requesting unit that transmits a request for a piece of reception information when a user has pushed an operational button (i.e., performed the first user operation). Further, claim 1 recites that the apparatus includes a reception information

receiving unit that receives the piece of reception information and records the piece of reception information onto a recording medium. Moreover, claim 1 recites that the apparatus includes an informing unit that, when the reception information receiving unit has completed recording the piece of reception information onto the recording medium, informs the user that the operational button is allowed to be released.

The structure of the informing unit is useful because the user is able to determine when the user is allowed to release the operational button after pushing the operational button. Knee, Hendricks, Strubbe and Krzyzanowski, or any combination thereof fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features as recited in independent claim 1.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Knee and Hendricks fail to disclose or suggest the informing unit, as recited in amended claim 1. In light of the above, this rejection relies on Strubbe for teaching the above-mentioned features which are admittedly lacking from Knee and Hendricks.

Strubbe teaches that a button 4 on a remote control unit 2 is used to start/stop a movement of a cursor, such that when the user presses the button 4 on the remote control unit 2, an IR signal is transmitted from the remote control unit 2 to start cursor movement, and when the user releases the button 4 of the remote control unit 2, an IR signal is transmitted from the remote control unit 2 to stop the cursor movement (see abstract and paragraph [0029]). In other words, Strubbe does not teach that the remote control unit 2 indicates to the user that the user can release the button 4.

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Strubbe merely teaches that the remote control unit is capable of transmitting a signal to start/stop a cursor movement based on the user

pressing/releasing a button, but fails to disclose or suggest the informing unit that, when the reception information receiving unit has completed recording the piece of reception information onto the recording medium, informs the user that the operational button is allowed to be released, as required by claim 1.

In other words, Strubbe does not teach that the remote control unit provides any indication to the user that the user is able to release the button once a specific operation has been completed. Therefore, Strubbe cannot be relied upon for teaching the informing unit that, when the reception information receiving unit has completed recording the piece of reception information onto the recording medium, informs the user that the operational button is allowed to be released, as required by claim 1.

Additionally, in view of the above, it is evident that Strubbe teaches transmitting signals without receiving any signals, but fails to disclose or suggest that a reception information receiving unit that receives the piece of reception information and records the piece of reception information onto a recording medium, such that, when the reception information receiving unit has completed recording the piece of reception information onto the recording medium, informs the user that the operational button is allowed to be released, as required by claim 1.

Applicants also note that the invention of Strubbe does not allow the user to determine when the user is allowed to release the button, which is a feature resulting from the structure required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 3-5, 8-10 and 16-18 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Knee, Hendricks and Strubbe.

Amended independent claims 11, 14 and 15 are directed to a system, a method, and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 11, 14 and 15 and claim 13 that depends therefrom are allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claim 13, which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee and Hendricks in view of Krzyzanowski (secondary reference), it is respectfully submitted this secondary reference does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claims 1, 11, 14 and 15 which are lacking from the Knee and Hendricks references. Therefore, no obvious combination of Knee and Hendricks with the secondary reference would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claims 11, 14 and 15 and claim 13 that depends therefrom.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Knee, Hendricks, Strubbe and/or Krzyzanowski or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Knee, Hendricks, Strubbe and/or Krzyzanowski to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 11 14 and 15 and claims 3-5, 8-10, 13 and 16-18 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tetsuji FUCHIKAMI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.03.30 16:07:58 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 30, 2009